

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated February 8, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time (one month) and the fee therefor are submitted herewith.

Rather than addressing the rejection of claims 21-40, all of which have been previously cast as apparatus claims, the applicant has canceled the same and replaced them with method claims 41-43 herein. These three claims avoid the necessity of examining and addressing the large number of previously pending claims and also serves to underscore distinguishing features over the prior art. In this connection, note that these method claims are essentially based on the previous apparatus claims with a further distinguishing process step being provided in the last paragraph of independent claim 41. Additional process or method steps are set forth in dependent claims 42 and 43.

None of these steps are disclosed or suggested in the prior art of record.

More specifically, compare the text of claim 41 herein to the text of the previously independent claim 21. You will see that the claims are identical, save for the last step, which recites "preventing opening of said viewing window at least during a period of time when said substrate is being processed with said removal liquid. Thus, from a substantive perspective, the present claims are now directed to a different invention.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON JUNE 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700